

REMARKS

By this Response, Applicant proposes to amend claims 1, 8, 12 and 19 and cancel claims 7 and 18. No claims have been added. Claims 2-4 and 11 have been previously canceled. Claims 1, 5, 6, 8-10, 12-17, and 19-21 are pending.

At the outset, Applicant is pleased to note that the Examiner considers the subject matter of claims 6-8 and 17-19 to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, the claim amendments provided above reflect this indication.

Rejection of Claims 1, 5, 9-10, 12-16 and 20-21 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 9-10, 12-16 and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Inaba* (U.S. Patent No. 6,137,732). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 12 are directed to an SRAM array and a method of operating an SRAM device comprising, *inter alia*, wherein said enhanced low operating voltage V_{ESS} is provided at a lower value during READ operation than during a WRITE operation.

It is the Examiner's position that *Inaba* describes an SRAM device and method as previously claimed, but does not teach or suggest that the enhanced low operating voltage V_{ESS} is provided at a lower value during READ operation than during a WRITE operation as incorporated into independent claims 1 and 12 from dependent claims 7 and 18, respectively.

Accordingly, all claims now present in the application should be considered allowable as incorporating allowable subject matter therein and depending from allowable claims.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 5, 9-10, 12-16 and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Applicant further submits that claims 5 and 9-10 are in condition for allowance, as are claims 13-16 and 20-21, at least by virtue of their dependency from allowable claims 1 and 12, respectively.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests that this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 be entered by the Examiner, placing claims 1, 5, 9-10, 12-16 and 20-21 into condition for allowance. Applicant submits that the proposed amendments of claim 1 and 12 do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully points out that the final action by the Examiner presented some new arguments as to the application of the art against Applicant's invention. It is respectfully submitted that the entering of the Amendment would allow the Applicant to reply to the final rejections and place the application into condition for allowance.

Finally, Applicant submits that entry of the amendment would place the application into better form for Appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant submits that this claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references applied against this application. Applicant therefore requests the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

If the Examiner believes that additional discussions or information might advance the prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is invited to contact the

undersigned at the telephone number listed below to expedite resolution of any outstanding issues.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 26, 2007

By: Barbara A. Fisher

Barbara A. Fisher
Reg. No. 31,906

Timothy M. Hsieh
Reg. No. 42,672

MH2 Technology Law Group, LLP
Tel: 703.917.0000